

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, 20, 22, 23, and 44-46 are now pending in the application. Claims 44-46 have been added as new. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Peterson (U.S. Pat. No. 3,105,530, hereinafter "Peterson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 14, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson as applied to claims 1, 13, and 22 above, and further in view of Akin (U.S. Pat. No. 2,731,049, hereinafter "Akin"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the previous response to the Office Action mailed February 10, 2006, Applicants amended claims 1, 13, and 22 to include "a quick-release mechanism for providing selective engagement between said support structure and said entire hood assembly." The Examiner now asserts that the wing nut and screw assembly of Peterson is a quick release mechanism. In order to further clarify the meaning of "quick release mechanism," Applicants have again amended claims 1, 13, and 22. Specifically, claims 1, 13, and 22 have been amended to define "said quick release mechanism including a biasing member urging said quick release mechanism into engagement with said support structure."

A biasing member is not included in the screw and wing nut arrangement previously considered a "quick release mechanism" by the Examiner. Applicants therefore submit that the quick release mechanism included in amended claims 1, 13, and 22 is not taught by Peterson. As such, claims 1, 13, and 22 should be in condition for allowance. The quick release mechanism was included in previous versions of the claims (namely claim 4) and, therefore, no new search or consideration is required by the Examiner since the amended features should have already been covered in the previous searches and considered by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 10-12 depend from claim 1, claims 14 and 20 depend from claim 13, and claim 23 depends from claim 22. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, 20, 22, and 23.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 44-46 have been added as new. Claims 44-46 depend from claims 1, 13, and 22, respectively and, therefore, should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 4 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, as indicated above, Applicants believe amended claim 1 to be in condition for allowance. Since claims 4 and 11 depend from claim 1, these claims should be in condition for allowance as well.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 8, 2006

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWM/JMP/slg
J:\HDP Forms\Client Forms\BlackDecker (0275_, 6736, 8913)\Amendment Form.dot